COMMITTEE ON RULES OF PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE
OF THE
JUDICIAL CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20544

DATE: July 27, 2000

TO: Judge Anthony J. Scirica, Chair
Standing Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure

FROM: Judge Will Garwood, Chair
Advisory Committee on Appellate Rules

I write to provide a brief synopsis of each of the proposed amendments to the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure ("FRAP") that will be published for comment in August.

1. Rule 1(b) — which provides that the rules of appellate procedure "do not extend or limit the jurisdiction of the courts of appeals" — is abrogated. Rule 1(b) has been rendered obsolete by recent Congressional enactments that give the Supreme Court authority to use the federal rules of practice and procedure to define when a rule of a district court is final for purposes of 28 U.S.C. § 1291 and to provide for appeals of interlocutory decisions that are not already authorized by 28 U.S.C. § 1292.

2. Rule 4(a)(1)(C) is added to provide that an appeal from an order granting or denying an application for a writ of error *coram*

nobis is governed by the time limitations of Rule 4(a) (which apply in civil cases) and not by the time limitations of Rule 4(b) (which apply in criminal cases).

3. Rule 4(a)(4)(A)(vi) is amended to delete a parenthetical that will become superfluous in light of the amendment to Rule 26(a)(2) (described below).

4. Rule 4(a)(5)(A)(ii) is amended to provide that a district court may extend the time to file a notice of appeal upon timely motion of a party if the party shows either excusable neglect or good cause, regardless of whether the timely motion is filed within the unextended appeal time or within the next 30 days.

5. Rule 4(a)(7) is amended to resolve several circuit splits over questions that arise when a party seeks to appeal a judgment or order that is required to be set forth on a separate document but is not. In conjunction with concurrently proposed amendments to Fed. R. Civ. P. 58, the amendment to Rule 4(a)(7) provides the following: (1) Orders disposing of the post-judgment motions that can toll the time to appeal under Rule 4(a)(4)(A) do not have to be set forth on separate documents. (2) When proposed Fed. R. Civ. P. 58 requires a judgment or order to be set forth on a separate document, that judgment or order is not entered until it is so set forth or until the expiration of 60 days after its entry in the civil docket, whichever occurs first. (3) An appellant may waive the separate document requirement and appeal an otherwise appealable judgment or order, even if the appellee objects. (4) An appellant may choose to waive the separate document requirement more than 30 days (60 days if the government is a party) after entry in the civil docket of the judgment or order that should have been set forth on a separate document but was not.

6. Rule 4(b)(5) is amended to provide that the filing of a motion to correct a sentence under Fed. R. Crim. P. 35(c) does not toll the time to appeal the judgment of conviction.

7. Rule 5(c) is amended to correct a typographical error in a cross-reference and to impose a 20-page limit on petitions for permission to appeal, cross-petitions for permission to appeal, and answers to petitions or cross-petitions for permission to appeal.

8. Rule 15(f) is added to provide that when, under governing law, an agency order is rendered non-final and non-appealable by the filing of a petition for rehearing or similar petition, any petition for review or application to enforce that non-final order will be held in abeyance and become effective when the agency disposes of the last such finality-blocking petition. Rule 15(f) is modeled after Rule 4(a)(4)(B)(i) and is intended to align the treatment of premature petitions for review of agency orders with the treatment of premature notices of appeal of judicial decisions.

9. Rule 21(d) is amended to correct a typographical error in a cross-reference and to impose a 20 page limit on petitions for extraordinary relief (such as mandamus) and answers to those petitions.

10. Rule 24(a) — which governs the ability of parties to proceed in forma pauperis on appeal — is amended to eliminate apparent conflicts with the Prison Litigation Reform Act of 1995.

11. Rule 25(c) is amended to authorize parties to use electronic means to serve other parties who have consented to electronic service, to permit parties to use the court's transmission facilities to make electronic service (when authorized by local rule), and to define when electronic service is complete. In addition,

Rule 25(c) is reorganized and subdivided to make it easier to understand.

12. Rule 25(d) is amended to require that a proof of electronic service must state the e-mail address of the party served.

13. Rule 26(a)(2) is amended to provide that, in computing deadlines under FRAP, intermediate Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays should be excluded when computing deadlines under 11 days but should be counted when computing deadlines of 11 days and over. At present, time is computed one way under the appellate rules and another way under the rules of civil and criminal procedure; the amendment eliminates that disparity.

14. Rule 26(c) is amended to provide that when a paper is served on a party by electronic means, and that party is required or permitted to respond to that paper within a prescribed period after service, 3 calendar days are added to the prescribed period.

15. Rule 26.1 is amended to require a nongovernmental corporate party not only to file a disclosure statement in which it identifies any parent corporation and any publicly held corporation that owns 10% or more of its stock (as a nongovernmental corporate party is required to do under existing Rule 26.1), but also to file a statement indicating that there are no such corporations if that is true, to include in any disclosure statement any additional information that may be required by the Judicial Conference of the United States, and to supplement any disclosure statement when circumstances warrant. Rule 26.1 is also amended to require parties other than nongovernmental corporate parties to file a disclosure statement in which they disclose any information that may be required by the Judicial Conference of the United States and to supplement any disclosure statement when circumstances warrant.

16. Rule 27(a)(3)(A) is amended to change the time within which a party must file a response to a motion from 10 days to 7 days. This amendment is proposed in conjunction with the proposed amendment to Rule 26(a)(2) (described above), under which intermediate Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays will no longer be counted when computing deadlines under 11 days.

17. Rule 27(a)(4) is amended to change the time within which a party must file a reply to a response to a motion from 7 days to 5 days. This amendment is proposed in conjunction with the proposed amendment to Rule 26(a)(2) (described above), under which intermediate Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays will no longer be counted when computing deadlines under 11 days.

18. Rule 27(d)(1)(B) is amended to provide that, if a cover is voluntarily used on a motion, response to a motion, or reply to a response to a motion, the cover must be white.

19. Rule 28(j) is amended to eliminate the prohibition on "argument" in letters that draw the court's attention to supplemental authorities and to impose a 250-word limit on such letters.

20. Rule 31(b) is amended to clarify that briefs must be served on all parties, including those not represented by counsel.

21. Rule 32(a)(2) is amended to provide that the cover on a supplemental brief must be tan.

22. Rule 32(a)(7)(C) is amended to provide that the filing of new Form 6 (described below) must be regarded as sufficient to meet the obligation imposed by Rule 32(a)(7)(C) to certify that a brief complies with the type-volume limitation of Rule 32(a)(7)(B).

23. Rule 32(c)(2)(A) is amended to provide that, if a cover is voluntarily used on a petition for panel rehearing, petition for hearing or rehearing en banc, answer to a petition for panel rehearing, or response to a petition for hearing or rehearing en banc, the cover must be white.

24. Rule 32(d) is amended to provide that every brief, motion, or other paper filed with the court must be signed by the attorney or unrepresented party who files it.

25. Rule 36(b) is amended so that the clerk may use electronic means to serve a copy of an opinion or judgment or to serve notice of the date when judgment was entered upon parties who have consented to electronic service.

26. Rule 41(b) is amended to provide that the mandate of a court must issue 7 *calendar* days after the time to file a petition for rehearing expires or 7 *calendar* days after the court denies a timely petition for panel rehearing, petition for rehearing en banc, or motion for stay of mandate, whichever is later. This amendment is proposed in conjunction with the proposed amendment to Rule 26(a)(2) (described above), under which intermediate Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays will no longer be counted when computing deadlines under 11 days, unless the deadline is stated in "calendar days."

27. Rule 44(b) is added to require a party to give written notice to the clerk if the party questions the constitutionality of a state statute in a proceeding in which the state is not a party, and to require the clerk to notify the state's attorney general of that challenge. Rule 44(b) is intended to implement 28 U.S.C. § 2403(b).

28. Rule 45(c) is amended so that the clerk may use electronic means to serve notice of entry of an order or judgment upon parties who have consented to electronic service.

29. Form 6 is added as a suggested form of a certificate of compliance with the type-volume limitation of Rule 32(a)(7)(B). Such a certificate is required by Rule 32(a)(7)(C).

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE FEDERAL RULES OF APPELLATE PROCEDURE*

Rule 1. Scope of Rules; Title

* * * * *

(b) ~~**Rules Do Not Affect Jurisdiction.** These rules do not extend or limit the jurisdiction of the courts of appeals.~~ [Abrogated]

* * * * *

Committee Note

Subdivision (b). Two recent enactments make it likely that, in the future, one or more of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure ("FRAP") will extend or limit the jurisdiction of the courts of appeals. In 1990, Congress amended the Rules Enabling Act to give the Supreme Court authority to use the federal rules of practice and procedure to define when a ruling of a district court is final for purposes of 28 U.S.C. § 1291. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2072(c). In 1992, Congress amended 28 U.S.C. § 1292 to give the Supreme Court authority to use the federal rules of practice and procedure to provide for appeals of interlocutory decisions that are not already authorized by 28 U.S.C. § 1292. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1292(e). Both § 1291 and § 1292 are unquestionably jurisdictional statutes, and thus, as soon as FRAP is amended to define finality for purposes of the former or to authorize interlocutory appeals not provided for by the latter, FRAP will "extend or limit the jurisdiction of the courts of appeals," and

---

* New matter is underlined; matter to be omitted is lined through.

subdivision (b) will become obsolete. For that reason, subdivision (b) has been abrogated.

Rule 4. Appeal as of Right — When Taken

(a) Appeal in a Civil Case.

(1) Time for Filing a Notice of Appeal.

(A) In a civil case, except as provided in Rules 4(a)(1)(B), 4(a)(4), and 4(c), the notice of appeal required by Rule 3 must be filed with the district clerk within 30 days after the judgment or order appealed from is entered.

(B) When the United States or its officer or agency is a party, the notice of appeal may be filed by any party within 60 days after the judgment or order appealed from is entered.

(C) An appeal from an order granting or denying an application for a writ of error *coram nobis* is an appeal in a civil case for purposes of Rule 4(a).

* * * * *

(4) **Effect of a Motion on a Notice of Appeal.**

(A) If a party timely files in the district court any of the following motions under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the time to file an appeal runs for all parties from the entry of the order disposing of the last such remaining motion:

* * * * *

(vi) for relief under Rule 60 if the motion is filed no later than 10 days ~~(computed using Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 6(a))~~ after the judgment is entered.

* * * * *

(5) **Motion for Extension of Time.**

(A) The district court may extend the time to file a notice of appeal if:

(i) a party so moves no later than 30 days after the time prescribed by this Rule 4(a) expires; and

(ii) regardless of whether its motion is filed before or during the 30 days after the time prescribed by this Rule 4(a) expires, that party shows excusable neglect or good cause.

* * * * *

(7) **Entry Defined.**

(A) A judgment or order is entered for purposes of this Rule 4(a) when it is entered ~~in compliance~~

~~with~~ for purposes of Rules 58(b) ~~and 79(a)~~ of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

(B) A failure to enter a judgment or order on a separate document when required by Rule 58(a)(1) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure does not affect the validity of an appeal from that judgment or order.

(b) Appeal in a Criminal Case.

* * * * *

(5) **Jurisdiction.** The filing of a notice of appeal under this Rule 4(b) does not divest a district court of jurisdiction to correct a sentence under Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 35(c), nor does the filing of a motion under 35(c) affect the validity of a notice of appeal filed before entry of the order disposing of the motion. The filing of a motion under Federal Rule of

Criminal Procedure 35(c) does not suspend the time for filing a notice of appeal from a judgment of conviction.

* * * * *

Committee Note

Subdivision 4(a)(1)(C). The federal courts of appeals have reached conflicting conclusions about whether an appeal from an order granting or denying an application for a writ of error *coram nobis* is governed by the time limitations of Rule 4(a) (which apply in civil cases) or by the time limitations of Rule 4(b) (which apply in criminal cases). *Compare United States v. Craig*, 907 F.2d 653, 655-57, *amended* 919 F.2d 57 (7th Cir. 1990); *United States v. Cooper*, 876 F.2d 1192, 1193-94 (5th Cir. 1989); and *United States v. Keogh*, 391 F.2d 138, 140 (2d Cir. 1968) (applying the time limitations of Rule 4(a)); *with Yasui v. United States*, 772 F.2d 1496, 1498-99 (9th Cir. 1985); and *United States v. Mills*, 430 F.2d 526, 527-28 (8th Cir. 1970) (applying the time limitations of Rule 4(b)). A new part (C) has been added to Rule 4(a)(1) to resolve this conflict by providing that the time limitations of Rule 4(a) will apply.

Subsequent to the enactment of Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b) and 28 U.S.C. § 2255, the Supreme Court has recognized the continued availability of a writ of error *coram nobis* in at least one narrow circumstance. In 1954, the Court permitted a litigant who had been convicted of a crime, served his full sentence, and been released from prison, but who was continuing to suffer a legal disability on account

of the conviction, to seek a writ of error *coram nobis* to set aside the conviction. *United States v. Morgan*, 346 U.S. 502 (1954). As the Court recognized, in the *Morgan* situation an application for a writ of error *coram nobis* "is of the same general character as [a motion] under 28 U.S.C. § 2255." *Id.* at 506 n.4. Thus, it seems appropriate that the time limitations of Rule 4(a), which apply when a district court grants or denies relief under 28 U.S.C. § 2255, should also apply when a district court grants or denies a writ of error *coram nobis*. In addition, the strong public interest in the speedy resolution of criminal appeals that is reflected in the shortened deadlines of Rule 4(b) is not present in the *Morgan* situation, as the party seeking the writ of error *coram nobis* has already served his or her full sentence.

Notwithstanding *Morgan*, it is not clear whether the Supreme Court continues to believe that the writ of error *coram nobis* is available in federal court. In civil cases, the writ has been expressly abolished by Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b). In criminal cases, the Supreme Court has recently stated that it has become "difficult to conceive of a situation" in which the writ "would be necessary or appropriate." *Carlisle v. United States*, 517 U.S. 416, 429 (1996) (quoting *United States v. Smith*, 331 U.S. 469, 475 n.4 (1947)). The amendment to Rule 4(a)(1) is not intended to express any view on this issue; rather, it is merely meant to specify time limitations for appeals.

Rule 4(a)(1)(C) applies only to motions that are in substance, and not merely in form, applications for writs of error *coram nobis*. Litigants may bring and label as applications for a writ of error *coram nobis* what are in reality motions for a new trial under Fed. R. Crim. P. 33 or motions for correction or reduction of a sentence under Fed.

R. Crim. P. 35. In such cases, the time limitations of Rule 4(b), and not those of Rule 4(a), should be enforced.

Subdivision (a)(4)(A)(vi). Rule 4(a)(4)(A)(vi) has been amended to remove a parenthetical that directed that the 10-day deadline be "computed using Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 6(a)." That parenthetical has become superfluous because Rule 26(a)(2) has been amended to require that all deadlines under 11 days be calculated as they are under Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(a).

Subdivision (a)(5)(A)(ii). Rule 4(a)(5)(A) permits the district court to extend the time to file a notice of appeal if two conditions are met. First, the party seeking the extension must file its motion no later than 30 days after the expiration of the time originally prescribed by Rule 4(a). Second, the party seeking the extension must show either excusable neglect or good cause. The text of Rule 4(a)(5)(A) does not distinguish between motions filed prior to the expiration of the original deadline and those filed after the expiration of the original deadline. Regardless of whether the motion is filed before or during the 30 days after the original deadline expires, the district court may grant an extension if a party shows either excusable neglect or good cause.

Despite the text of Rule 4(a)(5)(A), most of the courts of appeals have held that the good cause standard applies only to motions brought prior to the expiration of the original deadline and that the excusable neglect standard applies only to motions brought after the expiration of the original deadline. *See Pontarelli v. Stone*, 930 F.2d 104, 109-10 (1st Cir.1991) (collecting cases from the Second, Fifth, Sixth, Seventh, Eighth, Ninth, and Eleventh Circuits). These courts have relied heavily upon the Advisory Committee Note to the 1979

amendment to Rule 4(a)(5). But the Advisory Committee Note refers to a draft of the 1979 amendment that was ultimately rejected. The rejected draft directed that the good cause standard apply only to motions filed prior to the expiration of the original deadline. Rule 4(a)(5), as actually amended, did not. *See* 16A CHARLES ALAN WRIGHT, ET AL., FEDERAL PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE § 3950.3, at 148-49 (2d ed. 1996).

The failure of the courts of appeals to apply Rule 4(a)(5)(A) as written has also created tension between that rule and Rule 4(b)(4). As amended in 1998, Rule 4(b)(4) permits the district court to extend the time for filing a notice of appeal in a *criminal* case for an additional 30 days upon a finding of excusable neglect or good cause. Both Rule 4(b)(4) and the Advisory Committee Note to the 1998 amendment make it clear that an extension can be granted for either excusable neglect or good cause, regardless of whether a motion for an extension is filed before or after the time prescribed by Rule 4(b) expires.

Rule 4(a)(5)(A)(ii) has been amended to correct this misunderstanding and to bring the rule in harmony in this respect with Rule 4(b)(4). A motion for an extension filed prior to the expiration of the original deadline may be granted if the movant shows either excusable neglect or good cause. Likewise, a motion for an extension filed during the 30 days following the expiration of the original deadline may be granted if the movant shows either excusable neglect or good cause.

Subdivision (a)(7). Several circuit splits have arisen out of uncertainties about how Rule 4(a)(7)'s definition of when a judgment or order is "entered" interacts with the requirement in Fed. R. Civ. P.

58 that, to be "effective," a judgment must be set forth on a separate document. Rule 4(a)(7) and Fed. R. Civ. P. 58 have been amended to resolve those splits.

1. The first circuit split addressed by the amendments to Rule 4(a)(7) and Fed. R. Civ. P. 58 concerns the extent to which orders that dispose of post-judgment motions must be entered on separate documents. Under Rule 4(a)(4)(A), the filing of certain post-judgment motions tolls the time to appeal the underlying judgment until the "entry" of the order disposing of the last such remaining motion. Courts have disagreed about whether such an order must be set forth on a separate document before it is treated as "entered." This disagreement reflects a broader dispute among courts about whether Rule 4(a)(7) independently imposes a separate document requirement (a requirement that is distinct from the separate document requirement that is imposed by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure ("FRCP")) or whether Rule 4(a)(7) instead incorporates the separate document requirement as it exists in the FRCP. Further complicating the matter, courts in the former "camp" disagree among themselves about the scope of the separate document requirement that they interpret Rule 4(a)(7) as imposing, and courts in the latter "camp" disagree among themselves about the scope of the separate document requirement imposed by the FRCP.

Rule 4(a)(7) has been amended to make clear that it simply incorporates the separate document requirement as it exists in Fed. R. Civ. P. 58. Under amended Rule 4(a)(7), a judgment or order is entered for purposes of Rule 4(a) when that judgment or order is entered for purposes of Fed. R. Civ. P. 58(b). Thus, if a judgment or order is not entered for purposes of Fed. R. Civ. P. 58(b) until it is set forth on a separate document, that judgment or order is also not

entered for purposes of Rule 4(a) until it is so set forth. Similarly, if a judgment or order is entered for purposes of Fed. R. Civ. P. 58(b) even though not set forth on a separate document, that judgment or order is also entered for purposes of Rule 4(a).

In conjunction with the amendment to Rule 4(a)(7), Fed. R. Civ. P. 58 has been amended to provide that orders disposing of the post-judgment motions that can toll the time to appeal under Rule 4(a)(4)(A) do not have to be entered on separate documents. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 58(a)(1). Rather, such orders are entered for purposes of Fed. R. Civ. P. 58 — and therefore for purposes of Rule 4(a) — when they are entered in the civil docket pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 79(a). *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 58(b).

2. The second circuit split addressed by the amendments to Rule 4(a)(7) and Fed. R. Civ. P. 58 concerns the following question: When a judgment or order is required to be entered on a separate document under Fed. R. Civ. P. 58 but is not, does the time to appeal the judgment or order ever begin to run? According to every circuit except the First Circuit, the answer is "no." The First Circuit alone holds that parties will be deemed to have waived their right to have a judgment or order entered on a separate document three months after the judgment or order is entered in the civil docket. *See Fiore v. Washington County Community Mental Health Ctr.*, 960 F.2d 229, 236 (1st Cir. 1992) (en banc). Other circuits have rejected this cap as contrary to the relevant rules. *See, e.g.*, *United States v. Haynes*, 158 F.3d 1327, 1331 (D.C. Cir. 1998); *Hammack v. Baroid Corp.*, 142 F.3d 266, 269-70 (5th Cir. 1998); *Rubin v. Schottenstein, Zox & Dunn*, 110 F.3d 1247, 1253 n.4 (6th Cir. 1997), *vacated on other grounds* 143 F.3d 263 (6th Cir. 1998) (en banc). However, no court

has questioned the wisdom of imposing such a cap as a matter of policy.

Fed. R. Civ. P. 58 has been amended to impose such a cap. Under amended Fed. R. Civ. P. 58(b) — and therefore under amended Rule 4(a)(7) — a judgment or order is treated as entered when it is entered in the civil docket pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 79(a). There is one exception: When Fed. R. Civ. P. 58(a)(1) requires the judgment or order to be set forth on a separate document, that judgment or order is not entered until it is so set forth or until the expiration of 60 days after its entry in the civil docket, whichever occurs first. This cap will ensure that parties will not be given forever to appeal a judgment or order that should have been set forth on a separate document but was not.

3. The third circuit split — this split addressed only by the amendment to Rule 4(a)(7) — concerns whether the appellant may waive the separate document requirement over the objection of the appellee. In *Bankers Trust Co. v. Mallis*, 435 U.S. 381, 387 (1978) (per curiam), the Supreme Court held that the "parties to an appeal may waive the separate-judgment requirement of Rule 58." Specifically, the Supreme Court held that when a district court enters an order and "clearly evidence[s] its intent that the . . . order . . . represent[s] the final decision in the case," the order is a "final decision" for purposes of 28 U.S.C. § 1291, even if the order has not been entered on a separate document for purposes of Fed. R. Civ. P. 58. *Id.* Thus, the parties can choose to appeal without waiting for the order to be entered on a separate document.

Courts have disagreed about whether the consent of all parties is necessary to waive the separate document requirement. Some circuits

permit appellees to object to attempted *Mallis* waivers and to force appellants to return to the trial court, request entry of judgment on a separate document, and appeal a second time. *See, e.g.*, *Selletti v. Carey*, 173 F.3d 104, 109-10 (2d Cir. 1999); *Williams v. Borg*, 139 F.3d 737, 739-40 (9th Cir. 1998); *Silver Star Enters., Inc. v. M/V Saramacca*, 19 F.3d 1008, 1013 (5th Cir. 1994). Other courts disagree and permit *Mallis* waivers even if the appellee objects. *See, e.g.*, *Haynes*, 158 F.3d at 1331; *Miller v. Artistic Cleaners*, 153 F.3d 781, 783-84 (7th Cir. 1998); *Alvord-Polk, Inc. v. F. Schumacher & Co.*, 37 F.3d 996, 1006 n.8 (3d Cir. 1994).

New Rule 4(a)(7)(B) is intended both to codify the Supreme Court's holding in *Mallis* and to make clear that the decision whether to waive entry of a judgment or order on a separate document is the appellant's alone. It is, after all, the appellant who needs a clear signal as to when the time to file a notice of appeal has begun to run. If the appellant chooses to bring an appeal without awaiting entry of the judgment or order on a separate document, then there is no reason why the appellee should be able to object. All that would result from honoring the appellee's objection would be delay.

4. The final circuit split addressed by the amendment to Rule 4(a)(7) concerns the question whether an appellant who chooses to waive the separate document requirement must appeal within 30 days (60 days if the government is a party) from the entry in the civil docket of the judgment or order that should have been entered on a separate document but was not. In *Townsend v. Lucas*, 745 F.2d 933 (5th Cir. 1984), the district court dismissed a 28 U.S.C. § 2254 action on May 6, 1983, but failed to enter the judgment on a separate document. The plaintiff appealed on January 10, 1984. The Fifth Circuit dismissed the appeal, reasoning that, if the plaintiff waived the

separate document requirement, then his appeal would be from the May 6 order, and if his appeal was from the May 6 order, then it was untimely under Rule 4(a)(1). The Fifth Circuit stressed that the plaintiff could return to the district court, move for entry of judgment on a separate document, and appeal from that judgment within 30 days. *Id.* at 934. Several other cases have embraced the *Townsend* approach. *See, e.g.*, *Armstrong v. Ahitow*, 36 F.3d 574, 575 (7th Cir. 1994) (per curiam); *Hughes v. Halifax County Sch. Bd.*, 823 F.2d 832, 835-36 (4th Cir. 1987); *Harris v. McCarthy*, 790 F.2d 753, 756 n.1 (9th Cir. 1986).

Those cases are in the distinct minority. There are numerous cases in which courts have heard appeals that were not filed within 30 days (60 days if the government was a party) from the judgment or order that should have been entered on a separate document but was not. *See, e.g.*, *Haynes*, 158 F.3d at 1330-31; *Clough v. Rush*, 959 F.2d 182, 186 (10th Cir. 1992); *McCalden v. California Library Ass'n*, 955 F.2d 1214, 1218-19 (9th Cir. 1990). In the view of these courts, the remand in *Townsend* was "precisely the purposeless spinning of wheels abjured by the Court in the [*Mallis*] case." 15B CHARLES ALAN WRIGHT ET AL., FEDERAL PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE § 3915, at 259 n.8 (3d ed. 1992).

The Committee agrees with the majority of courts that have rejected the *Townsend* approach. In drafting new Rule 4(a)(7)(B), the Committee has been careful to avoid phrases such as "otherwise timely appeal" that might imply an endorsement of *Townsend.*

Subdivision (b)(5). Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 35(c) permits a district court, acting within seven days after the imposition of sentence, to correct an erroneous sentence in a criminal case.

Some courts have held that the filing of a motion for correction of a sentence suspends the time for filing a notice of appeal from the judgment of conviction. *See, e.g.*, *United States v. Carmouche*, 138 F.3d 1014, 1016 (5th Cir. 1998) (per curiam); *United States v. Morillo*, 8 F.3d 864, 869 (1st Cir. 1993). Those courts establish conflicting timetables for appealing a judgment of conviction after the filing of a motion to correct a sentence. In the First Circuit, the time to appeal is suspended only for the period provided by Fed. R. Crim. P. 35(c) for the district court to correct a sentence; the time to appeal begins to run again once seven days have passed after sentencing, even if the motion is still pending. By contrast, in the Fifth Circuit, the time to appeal does not begin to run again until the district court actually issues an order disposing of the motion.

Rule 4(b)(5) has been amended to eliminate the inconsistency concerning the effect of a motion to correct a sentence on the time for filing a notice of appeal. The amended rule makes clear that the time to appeal continues to run, even if a motion to correct a sentence is filed. The amendment is consistent with Rule 4(b)(3)(A), which lists the motions that toll the time to appeal, and notably omits any mention of a Fed. R. Crim. P. 35(c) motion. The amendment also should promote certainty and minimize the likelihood of confusion concerning the time to appeal a judgment of conviction.

If a district court corrects a sentence pursuant to Fed. R. Crim. P. 35(c), the time for filing a notice of appeal of the corrected sentence under Rule 4(b)(1) would begin to run when the court enters a new judgment reflecting the corrected sentence.

Rule 5. Appeal by Permission

* * * * *

(c) **Form of Papers; Number of Copies.** All papers must conform to Rule ~~32(a)(1)~~ 32(c)(2). Except by the court's permission, a paper must not exceed 20 pages, exclusive of the disclosure statement, the proof of service, and the accompanying documents required by Rule 5(b)(1)(E). An original and 3 copies must be filed unless the court requires a different number by local rule or by order in a particular case.

* * * * *

Committee Note

Subdivision (c). A petition for permission to appeal, a cross-petition for permission to appeal, and an answer to a petition or cross-petition for permission to appeal are all "other papers" for purposes of Rule 32(c)(2), and all of the requirements of Rule 32(a) apply to those papers, except as provided in Rule 32(c)(2). During the 1998 restyling of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure, Rule 5(c) was inadvertently changed to suggest that only the requirements of

Rule 32(a)(1) apply to such papers. Rule 5(c) has been amended to correct that error.

Rule 5(c) has been further amended to limit the length of papers filed under Rule 5.

Rule 15. Review or Enforcement of an Agency Order — How Obtained; Intervention

* * * * *

(f) Petition or Application Filed Before Agency Action Becomes Final. If a petition for review or application to enforce is filed after an agency announces or enters its order — but before it disposes of any petition for rehearing, reopening, or reconsideration that renders that order non-final and non-appealable — the petition or application becomes effective to appeal or seek enforcement of the order when the agency disposes of the last such petition for rehearing, reopening, or reconsideration.

Committee Note

Subdivision (f). Subdivision (f) is modeled after Rule 4(a)(4)(B)(i) and is intended to align the treatment of premature petitions for review of agency orders with the treatment of premature notices of appeal. Subdivision (f) does not address whether or when the filing of a petition for rehearing, reopening, or reconsideration renders an agency order non-final and hence non-appealable. That is left to the wide variety of statutes, regulations, and judicial decisions that govern agencies and appeals from agency decisions. *See, e.g.*, *ICC v. Brotherhood of Locomotive Eng'rs*, 482 U.S. 270 (1987). Rather, subdivision (f) provides that when, under governing law, an agency order is rendered non-final and non-appealable by the filing of a petition for rehearing, petition for reopening, petition for reconsideration, or functionally similar petition, any petition for review or application to enforce that non-final order will be held in abeyance and become effective when the agency disposes of the last such finality-blocking petition.

Subdivision (f) is designed to eliminate a procedural trap. Some circuits hold that petitions for review of agency orders that have been rendered non-final (and hence non-appealable) by the filing of a petition for rehearing (or similar petition) are "incurably premature," meaning that they do not ripen or become valid after the agency disposes of the rehearing petition. *See, e.g., TeleSTAR, Inc. v. FCC*, 888 F.2d 132, 134 (D.C. Cir. 1989) (per curiam); *Chu v. INS*, 875 F.2d 777, 781 (9th Cir. 1989), *overruled on other grounds by Pablo v. INS*, 72 F.3d 110 (9th Cir. 1995); *West Penn Power Co. v. EPA*, 860 F.2d 581, 588 (3d Cir. 1988); *Aeromar, C. Por A. v. Department of Transp.*, 767 F.2d 1491, 1493-94 (11th Cir. 1985). In these circuits, if a party aggrieved by an agency action does not file a second

timely petition for review after the petition for rehearing is denied by the agency, that party will find itself out of time: Its first petition for review will be dismissed as premature, and the deadline for filing a second petition for review will have passed. Subdivision (f) removes this trap.

Rule 21. Writs of Mandamus and Prohibition, and Other Extraordinary Writs

* * * * *

(d) Form of Papers; Number of Copies. All papers must conform to Rule ~~32(a)(1)~~ 32(c)(2). Except by the court's permission, a paper must not exceed 20 pages, exclusive of the disclosure statement, the proof of service, and the accompanying documents required by Rule 21(a)(2)(C). An original and 3 copies must be filed unless the court requires the filing of a different number by local rule or by order in a particular case.

Committee Note

Subdivision (d). A petition for a writ of mandamus or prohibition, an application for another extraordinary writ, and an

answer to such a petition or application are all "other papers" for purposes of Rule 32(c)(2), and all of the requirements of Rule 32(a) apply to those papers, except as provided in Rule 32(c)(2). During the 1998 restyling of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure, Rule 21(d) was inadvertently changed to suggest that only the requirements of Rule 32(a)(1) apply to such papers. Rule 21(d) has been amended to correct that error.

Rule 21(d) has been further amended to limit the length of papers filed under Rule 21.

Rule 24. Proceeding in Forma Pauperis

(a) Leave to Proceed in Forma Pauperis.

(1) **Motion in the District Court.** Except as stated in Rule 24(a)(3), a party to a district-court action who desires to appeal in forma pauperis must file a motion in the district court. The party must attach an affidavit that:

(A) shows in the detail prescribed by Form 4 of the Appendix of Forms, the party's inability to pay or to give security for fees and costs;

(B) claims an entitlement to redress; and

(C) states the issues that the party intends to present on appeal.

(2) **Action on the Motion.** If the district court grants the motion, the party may proceed on appeal without prepaying or giving security for fees and costs, unless the law requires otherwise. If the district court denies the motion, it must state its reasons in writing.

(3) **Prior Approval.** A party who was permitted to proceed in forma pauperis in the district-court action, or who was determined to be financially unable to obtain an adequate defense in a criminal case, may proceed on appeal in forma pauperis without further authorization, unless

(A) the district court — before or after the notice of appeal is filed — certifies that the appeal is not taken in good faith or finds that the party is not otherwise entitled to proceed in forma pauperis. ~~In that event, the district court must~~ and states in writing its reasons for the certification or finding; or

(B) the law requires otherwise.

* * * * *

Committee Note

Subdivision (a)(2). Section 804 of the Prison Litigation Reform Act of 1995 ("PLRA") amended 28 U.S.C. § 1915 to require that prisoners who bring civil actions or appeals from civil actions must "pay the full amount of a filing fee." 28 U.S.C. § 1915(b)(1). Prisoners who are unable to pay the full amount of the filing fee at the time that their actions or appeals are filed are generally required to pay part of the fee and then to pay the remainder of the fee in installments. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(b). By contrast, Rule 24(a)(2) provides that, after the district court grants a litigant's motion to proceed on appeal in forma pauperis, the litigant may proceed "without prepaying or giving

security for fees and costs." Thus, the PLRA and Rule 24(a)(2) appear to be in conflict.

Rule 24(a)(2) has been amended to resolve this conflict. Recognizing that future legislation regarding prisoner litigation is likely, the Committee has not attempted to incorporate into Rule 24 all of the requirements of the current version of 28 U.S.C. § 1915. Rather, the Committee has amended Rule 24(a)(2) to clarify that the rule is not meant to conflict with anything required by the PLRA or any other law.

Subdivision (a)(3). Rule 24(a)(3) has also been amended to eliminate an apparent conflict with the PLRA. Rule 24(a)(3) provides that a party who was permitted to proceed in forma pauperis in the district court may continue to proceed in forma pauperis in the court of appeals without further authorization, subject to certain conditions. The PLRA, by contrast, provides that a prisoner who was permitted to proceed in forma pauperis in the district court and who wishes to continue to proceed in forma pauperis on appeal may not do so "automatically," but must seek permission. *See, e.g.*, *Morgan v. Haro*, 112 F.3d 788, 789 (5th Cir. 1997) ("A prisoner who seeks to proceed IFP on appeal must obtain leave to so proceed despite proceeding IFP in the district court.").

Rule 24(a)(3) has been amended to resolve this conflict. Again, recognizing that future legislation regarding prisoner litigation is likely, the Committee has not attempted to incorporate into Rule 24 all of the requirements of the current version of 28 U.S.C. § 1915. Rather, the Committee has amended Rule 24(a)(3) to clarify that the rule is not meant to conflict with anything required by the PLRA or any other law.

Rule 25. Filing and Service

* * * * *

(c) Manner of Service.

(1) Service may be any of the following:

(A) personal, including delivery to a responsible person at the office of counsel;

(B) by mail; ~~or~~ ;

(C) by third-party commercial carrier for delivery within 3 calendar days; ; or

(D) by electronic means, if the party being served consents in writing.

(2) If authorized by local rule, a party may use the court's transmission equipment to make electronic service under Rule 25(c)(1)(D).

(3) When reasonable considering such factors as the immediacy of the relief sought, distance, and cost,

service on a party must be by a manner at least as expeditious as the manner used to file the paper with the court.

(4) ~~Personal service includes delivery of the copy to a responsible person at the office of counsel.~~ Service by mail or by commercial carrier is complete on mailing or delivery to the carrier. Service by electronic means is complete on transmission, unless the party making service is notified that the paper was not received by the party served.

(d) Proof of Service.

(1) A paper presented for filing must contain either of the following:

(A) an acknowledgment of service by the person served; or

(B) proof of service consisting of a statement by the person who made service certifying:

(i) the date and manner of service;

(ii) the names of the persons served; and

(iii) their mailing or e-mail addresses, or the addresses of the places of delivery.

* * * * *

Committee Note

Rule 25(a)(2)(D) presently authorizes the courts of appeals to permit papers to be *filed* by electronic means. Rule 25 has been amended in several respects to permit papers also to be *served* electronically. In addition, Rule 25(c) has been reorganized and subdivided to make it easier to understand.

Subdivision (c)(1)(D). New subdivision (c)(1)(D) has been added to permit service to be made electronically, such as by e-mail or fax. No party may be served electronically, either by the clerk or by another party, unless the party has consented in writing to such service.

A court of appeals may not, by local rule, forbid the use of electronic service on a party that has consented to its use. At the same time, courts have considerable discretion to use local rules to

regulate electronic service. Difficult and presently unforeseeable questions are likely to arise as electronic service becomes more common. Courts have the flexibility to use their local rules to address those questions. For example, courts may use local rules to set forth specific procedures that a party must follow before the party will be deemed to have given written consent to electronic service.

Subdivision (c)(2). The courts of appeals are authorized under Rule 25(a)(2)(D) to permit papers to be filed electronically. Technological advances may someday make it possible for a court to forward an electronically filed paper to all parties automatically or semi-automatically. When such court-facilitated service becomes possible, courts may decide to permit parties to use the courts' transmission facilities to serve electronically filed papers on other parties who have consented to such service. Court personnel would use the court's computer system to forward the papers, but the papers would be considered served by the filing parties, just as papers that are carried from one address to another by the United States Postal Service are considered served by the sending parties. New subdivision (c)(2) has been added so that the courts of appeals may use local rules to authorize such use of their transmission facilities, as well as to address the many questions that court-facilitated electronic service is likely to raise.

Subdivision (c)(4). The second sentence of new subdivision (c)(4) has been added to provide that electronic service is complete upon transmission. Transmission occurs when the sender performs the last act that he or she must perform to transmit a paper electronically; typically, it occurs when the sender hits the "send" or "transmit" button on an electronic mail program. There is one exception to the rule that electronic service is complete upon

transmission: If the sender is notified — by the sender's e-mail program or otherwise — that the paper was not received, service is not complete, and the sender must take additional steps to effect service. A paper has been "received" by the party on which it has been served as long as the party has the ability to retrieve it. A party cannot defeat service by choosing not to access electronic mail on its server.

Subdivision (d)(1)(B)(iii). Subdivision (d)(1)(B)(iii) has been amended to require that, when a paper is served by e-mail, the proof of service of that paper must include the e-mail address to which the paper was transmitted.

Rule 26. Computing and Extending Time

(a) Computing Time. The following rules apply in computing any period of time specified in these rules or in any local rule, court order, or applicable statute:

(1) Exclude the day of the act, event, or default that begins the period.

(2) Exclude intermediate Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays when the period is less than ~~7~~ 11 days, unless stated in calendar days.

* * * * *

(c) Additional Time after Service. When a party is required or permitted to act within a prescribed period after a paper is served on that party, 3 calendar days are added to the prescribed period unless the paper is delivered on the date of service stated in the proof of service. For purposes of this Rule 26(c), a paper that is served electronically is not treated as delivered on the date of service stated in the proof of service.

Committee Note

Subdivision (a)(2). The Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure compute time differently than the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure. Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(a) and Fed. R. Crim. P. 45(a) provide that, in computing any period of time, "[w]hen the period of time prescribed or allowed is less than 11 days, intermediate Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays shall be excluded in the computation." By contrast, Fed. R. App. P. 26(a)(2) provides that, in computing any period of time, a litigant should "[e]xclude intermediate Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays when the period is less than 7 days, unless stated in calendar days." Thus, deadlines of 7, 8, 9, and 10 days are calculated differently under the rules of civil

and criminal procedure than they are under the rules of appellate procedure. This creates a trap for unwary litigants. No good reason for this discrepancy is apparent, and thus Rule 26(a)(2) has been amended so that, under all three sets of rules, intermediate Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays will be excluded when computing deadlines under 11 days but will be counted when computing deadlines of 11 days and over.

Subdivision (c). Rule 26(c) has been amended to provide that when a paper is served on a party by electronic means, and that party is required or permitted to respond to that paper within a prescribed period, 3 calendar days are added to the prescribed period. Electronic service is usually instantaneous, but sometimes it is not, because of technical problems. Also, if a paper is electronically transmitted to a party on a Friday evening, the party may not realize that he or she has been served until two or three days later. Finally, extending the "three-day rule" to electronic service will encourage parties to consent to such service under Rule 25(c).

Rule 26.1. ~~Corporate~~ Disclosure Statement

(a) Who Must File.

(1) **Nongovernmental corporate party.** Any nongovernmental corporate party to a proceeding in a court of appeals must file a statement that:

(A) identify~~ying~~ies ~~all its~~ any parent corporations and ~~listing~~ any publicly held ~~company~~ corporation that owns 10% or more of ~~the party's~~ its stock or states that there is no such corporation, and

(B) discloses any additional information that may be required by the Judicial Conference of the United States.

(2) **Other party.** Any other party to a proceeding in a court of appeals must file a statement that discloses any information that may be required by the Judicial Conference of the United States.

(b) Time for Filing; Supplemental Filing. A party must file the Rule 26.1(a) statement with the principal brief or upon filing a motion, response, petition, or answer in the court of appeals, whichever occurs first, unless a local rule requires earlier filing. Even if the statement has

already been filed, the party's principal brief must include the statement before the table of contents. A party must supplement its statement whenever the information that must be disclosed under Rule 26.1(a) changes.

(c) **Number of Copies.** If the Rule 26.1(a) statement is filed before the principal brief, or if a supplemental statement is filed, the party must file an original and 3 copies unless the court requires a different number by local rule or by order in a particular case.

Committee Note

Subdivision (a). Rule 26.1(a) presently requires nongovernmental corporate parties to file a "corporate disclosure statement." In that statement, a nongovernmental corporate party is required to identify all of its parent corporations and all publicly held corporations that own 10% or more of its stock. The corporate disclosure statement is intended to assist judges in determining whether they must recuse themselves by reason of "a financial interest in the subject matter in controversy." Code of Judicial Conduct, Canon 3C(1)(c) (1972).

Rule 26.1(a) has been amended to require that nongovernmental corporate parties who currently do not have to file a corporate disclosure statement — that is, nongovernmental corporate parties who do not have any parent corporations and at least 10% of whose stock is not owned by any publicly held corporation — inform the court of that fact. At present, when a corporate disclosure statement is not filed, courts do not know whether it has not been filed because there was nothing to report or because of ignorance of Rule 26.1(a).

Rule 26.1(a) does not require the disclosure of all information that could conceivably be relevant to a judge who is trying to decide whether he or she has a "financial interest" in a case. Experience with divergent disclosure practices and improving technology may provide the foundation for more comprehensive disclosure requirements. The Judicial Conference, supported by the committees that work regularly with the Code of Judicial Conduct and by the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, is in the best position to develop any additional requirements and to adjust those requirements as technological and other developments warrant. Thus, Rule 26.1(a) has been amended to authorize the Judicial Conference to promulgate more detailed financial disclosure requirements — requirements that might apply beyond nongovernmental corporate parties.

As has been true in the past, Rule 26.1(a) does not forbid the promulgation of local rules that require disclosures in addition to those required by Rule 26.1(a) itself. However, along with the authority provided to the Judicial Conference to require additional disclosures is the authority to preempt any local rulemaking on the topic of financial disclosure.

Subdivision (b). Rule 26.1(b) has been amended to require parties to file supplemental disclosure statements whenever there is a change in the information that Rule 26.1(a) requires the parties to disclose. For example, if a publicly held corporation acquires 10% or more of a party's stock after the party has filed its disclosure statement, the party should file a supplemental statement identifying that publicly held corporation.

Subdivision (c). Rule 26.1(c) has been amended to provide that a party who is required to file a supplemental disclosure statement must file an original and 3 copies, unless a local rule or an order entered in a particular case provides otherwise.

Rule 27. Motions

(a) In General.

* * * * *

(3) **Response.**

(A) **Time to file.** Any party may file a response to a motion; Rule 27(a)(2) governs its contents. The response must be filed within ~~10~~ 7 days after service of the motion unless the court shortens or extends the time. A motion

authorized by Rules 8, 9, 18, or 41 may be granted before the ~~10~~ 7-day period runs only if the court gives reasonable notice to the parties that it intends to act sooner.

* * * * *

(4) **Reply to Response.** Any reply to a response must be filed within ~~7~~ 5 days after service of the response. A reply must not present matters that do not relate to the response.

* * * * *

(d) Form of Papers; Page Limits; and Number of Copies

(1) **Format.**

* * * * *

(B) **Cover.** A cover is not required, but there must be a caption that includes the case number, the name of the court, the title of the case, and a

brief descriptive title indicating the purpose of the motion and identifying the party or parties for whom it is filed. If a cover is used, it must be white.

* * * * *

Committee Note

Subdivision (a)(3)(A). Subdivision (a)(3)(A) presently requires that a response to a motion be filed within 10 days after service of the motion. Intermediate Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays are counted in computing that 10-day deadline, which means that, except when the 10-day deadline ends on a weekend or legal holiday, parties generally must respond to motions within 10 actual days.

Fed. R. App. P. 26(a)(2) has been amended to provide that, in computing any period of time, a litigant should "[e]xclude intermediate Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays when the period is less than 11 days, unless stated in calendar days." This change in the method of computing deadlines means that 10-day deadlines (such as that in subdivision (a)(3)(A)) have been lengthened as a practical matter. Under the new computation method, parties would never have less than 14 actual days to respond to motions, and legal holidays could extend that period to as much as 18 days.

Permitting parties to take two weeks or more to respond to motions would introduce significant and unwarranted delay into

appellate proceedings. For that reason, the 10-day deadline in subdivision (a)(3)(A) has been reduced to 7 days. This change will, as a practical matter, ensure that every party will have at least 9 actual days — but, in the absence of a legal holiday, no more than 11 actual days — to respond to motions. The court continues to have discretion to shorten or extend that time in appropriate cases.

Subdivision (a)(4). Subdivision (a)(4) presently requires that a reply to a response to a motion be filed within 7 days after service of the response. Intermediate Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays are counted in computing that 7-day deadline, which means that, except when the 7-day deadline ends on a weekend or legal holiday, parties generally must reply to responses to motions within one week.

Fed. R. App. P. 26(a)(2) has been amended to provide that, in computing any period of time, a litigant should "[e]xclude intermediate Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays when the period is less than 11 days, unless stated in calendar days." This change in the method of computing deadlines means that 7-day deadlines (such as that in subdivision (a)(4)) have been lengthened as a practical matter. Under the new computation method, parties would never have less than 9 actual days to reply to responses to motions, and legal holidays could extend that period to as much as 13 days.

Permitting parties to take 9 or more days to reply to a response to a motion would introduce significant and unwarranted delay into appellate proceedings. For that reason, the 7-day deadline in subdivision (a)(4) has been reduced to 5 days. This change will, as a practical matter, ensure that every party will have 7 actual days to file replies to responses to motions (in the absence of a legal holiday).

Subdivision (d)(1)(B). A cover is not required on motions, responses to motions, or replies to responses to motions. However, Rule 27(d)(1)(B) has been amended to provide that if a cover is nevertheless used on such a paper, the cover must be white. The amendment is intended to promote uniformity in federal appellate practice.

Rule 28. Briefs

* * * * *

(j) Citation of Supplemental Authorities. If pertinent and significant authorities come to a party's attention after the party's brief has been filed — or after oral argument but before decision — a party may promptly advise the circuit clerk by letter, with a copy to all other parties, setting forth the citations. The letter must state ~~without argument~~ the reasons for the supplemental citations, referring either to the page of the brief or to a point argued orally. The body of the letter must not exceed

250 words. Any response must be made promptly and must be similarly limited.

Committee Note

Subdivision (j). In the past, Rule 28(j) has required parties to describe supplemental authorities "without argument." Enforcement of this restriction has been lax, in part because of the difficulty of distinguishing "state[ment] . . . [of] the reasons for the supplemental citations," which is required, from "argument" about the supplemental citations, which is forbidden.

As amended, Rule 28(j) continues to require parties to state the reasons for supplemental citations, with reference to the part of a brief or oral argument to which the supplemental citations pertain. But Rule 28(j) no longer forbids "argument." Rather, Rule 28(j) permits parties to decide for themselves what they wish to say about supplemental authorities. The only restriction upon parties is that the body of a Rule 28(j) letter — that is, the part of the letter that begins with the first word after the salutation and ends with the last word before the complimentary close — cannot exceed 250 words. All words found in footnotes will count toward the 250-word limit.

Rule 31. Serving and Filing Briefs

* * * * *

(b) Number of Copies. Twenty-five copies of each brief must be filed with the clerk and 2 copies must be served

on each unrepresented party and on counsel for each separately represented party. An unrepresented party proceeding in forma pauperis must file 4 legible copies with the clerk, and one copy must be served on each unrepresented party and on counsel for each separately represented party. The court may by local rule or by order in a particular case require the filing or service of a different number.

* * * * *

Committee Note

Subdivision (b). In requiring that two copies of each brief "must be served on counsel for each separately represented party," Rule 31(b) may be read to imply that copies of briefs need not be served on unrepresented parties. The Rule has been amended to clarify that briefs must be served on all parties, including those who are not represented by counsel.

Rule 32. Form of Briefs, Appendices, and Other Papers

(a) Form of a Brief.

* * * * *

(2) **Cover.** Except for filings by unrepresented parties, the cover of the appellant's brief must be blue; the appellee's, red; an intervenor's or amicus curiae's, green; ~~and~~ any reply brief, gray; and any supplemental brief, tan. The front cover of a brief must contain:

(A) the number of the case centered at the top;

(B) the name of the court;

(C) the title of the case (see Rule 12(a));

(D) the nature of the proceeding (e.g., Appeal, Petition for Review) and the name of the court, agency, or board below;

(E) the title of the brief, identifying the party or parties for whom the brief is filed; and

(F) the name, office address, and telephone number of counsel representing the party for whom the brief is filed.

* * * * *

(7) **Length.**

(C) **Certificate of compliance.**

(i) A brief submitted under Rule 32(a)(7)(B) must include a certificate by the attorney, or an unrepresented party, that the brief complies with the type-volume limitation. The person preparing the certificate may rely on the word or line count of the word-processing system used to prepare the brief. The certificate must state either:

- the number of words in the brief; or

- the number of lines of monospaced type in the brief.

(ii) Form 6 in the Appendix of Forms is a suggested form of a certificate of compliance. Use of Form 6 must be regarded as sufficient to meet the requirements of Rule 32(a)(7)(C)(i).

* * * * *

(c) Form of Other Papers.

(1) **Motion.** The form of a motion is governed by Rule 27(d).

(2) **Other Papers.** Any other paper, including a petition for panel rehearing and a petition for hearing or rehearing en banc, and any response to such a petition, must be reproduced in the manner

prescribed by Rule 32(a), with the following exceptions:

(A) A ~~a~~ cover is not necessary if the caption and signature page of the paper together contain the information required by Rule 32(a)(2)~~, and~~. If a cover is used, it must be white.

(B) Rule 32(a)(7) does not apply.

(d) Signature. Every brief, motion, or other paper filed with the court must be signed by the party filing the paper or, if the party is represented, by one of the party's attorneys.

(de)Local Variation. Every court of appeals must accept documents that comply with the form requirements of this rule. By local rule or order in a particular case a court of appeals may accept documents that do not meet all of the form requirements of this rule.

Committee Note

Subdivision (a)(2). On occasion, a court may permit or order the parties to file supplemental briefs addressing an issue that was not addressed — or adequately addressed — in the principal briefs. Rule 32(a)(2) has been amended to require that tan covers be used on such supplemental briefs. The amendment is intended to promote uniformity in federal appellate practice. At present, the local rules of the circuit courts conflict. *See, e.g.*, D.C. Cir. R. 28(g) (requiring yellow covers on supplemental briefs); 11th Cir. R. 32, I.O.P. 1 (requiring white covers on supplemental briefs).

Subdivision (a)(7)(C). If the principal brief of a party exceeds 30 pages, or if the reply brief of a party exceeds 15 pages, Rule 32(a)(7)(C) provides that the party or the party's attorney must certify that the brief complies with the type-volume limitation of Rule 32(a)(7)(B). Rule 32(a)(7)(C) has been amended to refer to Form 6 (which has been added to the Appendix of Forms) and to provide that a party or attorney who uses Form 6 has complied with Rule 32(a)(7)(C). No court may provide to the contrary, in its local rules or otherwise.

Form 6 requests not only the information mandated by Rule 32(a)(7)(C), but also information that will assist courts in enforcing the typeface requirements of Rule 32(a)(5) and the type style requirements of Rule 32(a)(6). Parties and attorneys are not required to use Form 6, but they are encouraged to do so.

Subdivision (c)(2)(A). Under Rule 32(c)(2)(A), a cover is not required on a petition for panel rehearing, petition for hearing or rehearing en banc, answer to a petition for panel rehearing, response

to a petition for hearing or rehearing en banc, or any other paper. Rule 32(d) makes it clear that no court can require that a cover be used on any of these papers. However, nothing prohibits a court from providing in its local rules that if a cover on one of these papers is "voluntarily" used, it must be a particular color. Several circuits have adopted such local rules. *See, e.g.*, Fed. Cir. R. 35(c) (requiring yellow covers on petitions for hearing or rehearing en banc and brown covers on responses to such petitions); Fed. Cir. R. 40(a) (requiring yellow covers on petitions for panel rehearing and brown covers on answers to such petitions); 7th Cir. R. 28 (requiring blue covers on petitions for rehearing filed by appellants or answers to such petitions, and requiring red covers on petitions for rehearing filed by appellees or answers to such petitions); 9th Cir. R. 40-1 (requiring blue covers on petitions for panel rehearing filed by appellants and red covers on answers to such petitions, and requiring red covers on petitions for panel rehearing filed by appellees and blue covers on answers to such petitions); 11th Cir. R. 35-6 (requiring white covers on petitions for hearing or rehearing en banc).

These conflicting local rules create a hardship for counsel who practice in more than one circuit. For that reason, Rule 32(c)(2)(A) has been amended to provide that if a party chooses to use a cover on a paper that is not required to have one, that cover must be white. The amendment is intended to preempt all local rulemaking on the subject of cover colors and thereby promote uniformity in federal appellate practice.

Subdivisions (d) and (e). Former subdivision (d) has been redesignated as subdivision (e), and a new subdivision (d) has been added. The new subdivision (d) requires that every brief, motion, or other paper filed with the court be signed by the attorney or

unrepresented party who files it, much as Fed. R. Civ. P. 11(a) imposes a signature requirement on papers filed in district court. (An appendix filed with the court does not have to be signed.) By requiring a signature, subdivision (d) ensures that a readily identifiable attorney or party takes responsibility for every paper. The courts of appeals already have authority to sanction attorneys and parties who file papers that contain misleading or frivolous assertions, *see, e.g.*, 28 U.S.C. § 1912, Fed. R. App. P. 38 & 46(b)(1)(B), and thus subdivision (d) has not been amended to incorporate provisions similar to those found in Fed. R. Civ. P. 11(b) and 11(c).

Rule 36. Entry of Judgment; Notice

* * * * *

(b) Notice. On the date when judgment is entered, the clerk must ~~mail to~~ serve on all parties a copy of the opinion — or the judgment, if no opinion was written — and a notice of the date when the judgment was entered.

Committee Note

Subdivision (b). Subdivision (b) has been amended so that the clerk may use electronic means to serve a copy of the opinion or judgment or to serve notice of the date when judgment was entered upon parties who have consented to such service.

Rule 41. Mandate: Contents; Issuance and Effective Date; Stay

* * * * *

(b) When Issued. The court's mandate must issue 7 calendar days after the time to file a petition for rehearing expires, or 7 calendar days after entry of an order denying a timely petition for panel rehearing, petition for rehearing en banc, or motion for stay of mandate, whichever is later. The court may shorten or extend the time.

* * * * *

Committee Note

Subdivision (b). Subdivision (b) directs that the mandate of a court must issue 7 days after the time to file a petition for rehearing expires or 7 days after the court denies a timely petition for panel rehearing, petition for rehearing en banc, or motion for stay of mandate, whichever is later. Intermediate Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays are counted in computing that 7-day deadline, which means that, except when the 7-day deadline ends on a weekend or

legal holiday, the mandate issues exactly one week after the triggering event.

Fed. R. App. P. 26(a)(2) has been amended to provide that, in computing any period of time, one should "[e]xclude intermediate Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays when the period is less than 11 days, unless stated in calendar days." This change in the method of computing deadlines means that 7-day deadlines (such as that in subdivision (b)) have been lengthened as a practical matter. Under the new computation method, a mandate would never issue sooner than 9 actual days after a triggering event, and legal holidays could extend that period to as much as 13 days.

Delaying mandates for 9 or more days would introduce significant and unwarranted delay into appellate proceedings. For that reason, subdivision (b) has been amended to require that mandates issue 7 *calendar* days after a triggering event.

Rule 44. Case Involving a Constitutional Question When the United States or the Relevant State is Not a Party

(a) Constitutional Challenge to Federal Statute. If a party questions the constitutionality of an Act of Congress in a proceeding in which the United States or its agency, officer, or employee is not a party in an official capacity, the questioning party must give written notice to the

circuit clerk immediately upon the filing of the record or as soon as the question is raised in the court of appeals. The clerk must then certify that fact to the Attorney General.

(b) **Constitutional Challenge to State Statute.** If a party questions the constitutionality of a statute of a State in a proceeding in which that State or its agency, officer, or employee is not a party in an official capacity, the questioning party must give written notice to the circuit clerk immediately upon the filing of the record or as soon as the question is raised in the court of appeals. The clerk must then certify that fact to the attorney general of the State.

Committee Note

Rule 44 requires that a party who "questions the constitutionality of an Act of Congress" in a proceeding in which the United States is not a party must provide written notice of that challenge to the clerk.

Rule 44 is designed to implement 28 U.S.C. § 2403(a), which states that:

> In any action, suit or proceeding in a court of the United States to which the United States or any agency, officer or employee thereof is not a party, wherein the constitutionality of any Act of Congress affecting the public interest is drawn in question, the court shall certify such fact to the Attorney General, and shall permit the United States to intervene . . . for argument on the question of constitutionality.

The subsequent section of the statute — § 2403(*b*) — contains virtually identical language imposing upon the courts the duty to notify the attorney general of a *state* of a constitutional challenge to any statute of that state. But § 2403(b), unlike § 2403(a), was not implemented in Rule 44.

Rule 44 has been amended to correct this omission. The text of former Rule 44 regarding constitutional challenges to federal statutes now appears as Rule 44(a), while new language regarding constitutional challenges to state statutes now appears as Rule 44(b).

Rule 45. Clerk's Duties

* * * * *

(c) Notice of an Order or Judgment. Upon the entry of an order or judgment, the circuit clerk must immediately

serve ~~by mail~~ a notice of entry on each party ~~to the proceeding~~, with a copy of any opinion, and must note the ~~mailing~~ date of service on the docket. Service on a party represented by counsel must be made on counsel.

* * * * *

Committee Note

Subdivision (c). Subdivision (c) has been amended so that the clerk may use electronic means to serve notice of entry of an order or judgment upon parties who have consented to such service.

Form 6. Certificate of Compliance With Rule 32(a)

Certificate of Compliance With Type-Volume Limitation, Typeface Requirements, and Type-Style Requirements

1. This brief complies with the type-volume limitation of Fed. R. App. P. 32(a)(7)(B) because:

- ☐ this brief contains [*state the number of*] words, excluding the parts of the brief exempted by Fed. R. App. P. 32(a)(7)(B)(iii), *or*

- ☐ this brief uses a monospaced typeface and contains [*state the number of*] lines of text, excluding the parts of the brief exempted by Fed. R. App. P. 32(a)(7)(B)(iii).

2. This brief complies with the typeface requirements of Fed. R. App. P. 32(a)(5) and the type-style requirements of Fed. R. App. P. 32(a)(6) because:

- ☐ this brief has been prepared in a proportionally spaced typeface using [*state name and version of word processing program*] in [*state font size and name of type style*], *or*

- ☐ this brief has been prepared in a monospaced typeface using [*state name and version of word processing program*] with [*state number of characters per inch and name of type style*].

(s)_____

Attorney for _____

Dated: _____